

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9-11 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 3 and 6-8 have been cancelled.

Initially, it is noted that the Examiner has indicated on the Office Action Summary page that claims 1-11 are pending and are rejected. However, only claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9-11 are pending and claims 3 and 6-8 have been cancelled in the previous amendment.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1-11 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kawamoto et al. (US 5,511,798) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references. However, the language of claim 1 has been slightly modified in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. More specifically, the

wording "including" has been changed to "being formed of" to be consistent with original claim 6.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

a sealing layer disposed between said I/O shield and the housing, said sealing layer sealing said housing aperture and forming an electrical contact with said wall surfaces of said housing aperture, said sealing layer being formed of readily malleable electrically conductive material.

Kawamoto et al. disclose a sealing, which is made of a compressible urethane foam coated with silver-coating nylon fabric. The urethane foam is compressible, but not conductive. The conductive element of the sealing disclosed by Kawamoto et al. is the coating of the urethane foam. This is a disadvantage in comparison to the invention of the instant application in which the sealing is completely made of electrically conductive and easily malleable material. If the surface of the sealing layer disclosed by Kawamoto et al. is disturbed, the EMI shielding effect decreases. The advantage of the invention of the instant application is that a disturbance of the surface of the sealing does not change the EMI shielding effect in any way.

Clearly, Kawamoto et al. do not show "a sealing layer disposed between said I/O shield and the housing, said sealing layer sealing said housing aperture and forming an electrical contact with said wall surfaces of said housing aperture, said sealing layer being formed of readily malleable electrically conductive material," as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over Kawamoto et al. and since all of the dependent claims are dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable as discussed above and claims 2, 4-5, and 9-11 are dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable in dependent form. A rewrite is therefore believed to be unnecessary at this time.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9-11 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition

for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of
search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which
might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to
the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-
1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants

Yonghong Chen
Reg. No. 56,150

YC

March 4, 2005


Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97(e), the undersigned herewith states that each item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was first cited in any communication from a foreign office in a counterpart foreign patent application not more than three months prior to the filing of the information disclosure statement.

If no translation of pertinent portions of any foreign language patents or publications mentioned above is included with the aforementioned copies of those applications, patents and/or publications, it is because no existing translation is readily available to the applicant.

Applicants herewith petition for consideration of this *Information Disclosure Statement* under 37 C.F.R. 1.97(d)(2). Enclosed is the IDS processing fee under 37 C.F.R. 1.17 (p) in the amount of \$180.00.

Respectfully submitted,



Laurence A. Greenberg (29,308)

Date: March 4, 2005

Lerner And Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101
/bb